

New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
Generic Investigation Into Utility Poles  
Docket No. DM 05-172  
UES Response to Follow-Up Data Requests Set 3, Topic 2

---

**Request No. Staff Ref 3-1:**

- 3-1A. All – Please provide the frequency of pole deliveries by pole yard or location.
- 3-1B. Electrics – Please provide spare pole inventory by length and class for each pole yard.
- 3-1C. Utilil – Please explain why the number of poles set in the Capital area decreased so much from 2004 to 2005.
- 3-1D. All - Please provide the space allocation charts on 35' through 45' joint poles. Please also provide the source for the chart designations.
- 3-1E. All – Is your company experiencing difficulty obtaining poles for inventory? If so, please state the reason(s).

**Response:**

- 3-1A. Poles are generally ordered and delivered as needed. There is no set frequency or schedule; we average between 8-10 deliveries per year at each location. New poles can generally be obtained within 5 to 7 business days.
- 3-1B. Please refer to Attachment UES-Staff Ref 3-1B.
- 3-1C. The decrease in poles set in the UES-Capital area between 2004 and 2005 resulted from decreased customer driven work, including line extensions; a decrease in telephone requests; a decrease in poles set for circuit upgrades including voltage conversions; and a decrease in condemned poles. All of these categories of work declined relative to the prior year.
- 3-1D. The space allocation chart was provided in response to Staff 4-3. Please reference Attachment UES-Staff 4-3. The source for this chart is IOP #5, a copy of which was provided with Attachment UES-Staff 4-7.
- 3-1E. We have experienced no difficulties obtaining poles for inventory.

**Person Responsible:** Robert Conner, Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

**Date:** May 23, 2006

New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
Generic Investigation Into Utility Poles  
Docket No. DM 05-172  
UES Response to Follow-Up Data Requests Set 3, Topic 2

---

**Request No. Staff Ref 3-5:**

- 3-5A. All – What is the average response time to hear back from the joint owner when a request for service involving a new pole set is received? Please provide median and mean response times.
- 3-5B. Unitil – Please provide a copy of the letter/correspondence Unitil received where Verizon informed you that future pole sets in the Verizon maintenance areas would take 12 weeks after such requests are received.
- 3-5C. VZ – (the following request is to exclude FTTP work and personnel) Please supply separately the number of hours of your company's line force (listed as 70 in DR 3-4 as of 1/1/05 in New Hampshire) performing regular work and overtime work in New Hampshire by month for the period of January 2005 through the most current month available in 2006. In your response, please break the data down by garage and whether the overtime hours were expended for routine or emergency work.
- 3-5D. VZ – (the following request is to exclude FTTP work and personnel) Please repeat request 3-5C above for personnel performing similar work in New Hampshire from other states.
- 3-5E. VZ – (the following request is to exclude FTTP work and personnel) For the personnel included in request 3-5C above, please supply the maximum number of regular time hours available by month for the period of January 2005 through the most current month available in 2006 assuming no vacations, sick time, etc. and actual regular hours worked.
- 3-5F. VZ – Please supply the number of line force (listed as 70 in DR 3-4 as of 1/1/05 in New Hampshire) at the beginning of each month for the period of January 2005 through the most current month available in 2006. Please also supply similar information for personnel performing FTTP work.

**Response:**

- 3-5A. Unitil does not track our joint owner's response times as a normal course of business and therefore cannot provide the average, median or mean response times.

New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
Generic Investigation Into Utility Poles  
Docket No. DM 05-172  
UES Response to Follow-Up Data Requests Set 3, Topic 2

---

3-5B. Please reference Attachment UES-Staff 3-5B No. 1, the e-mail from Verizon notifying us that future pole sets in the Verizon maintenance areas would take 12 weeks. Please note that the 12 weeks is from the time the representatives *meet in the field*, and from not the time such requests are received.

Normally, Verizon will agree to meet in the field within about 5-10 business days from the date of the request. However, in recent months we have been experiencing delays with the availability of Verizon representatives to meet in the field, which further adds to the project delay. Reference Attachment UES-Staff 3-5B No. 2, and Attachment UES-Staff 3-5B No. 3.

3-5C. Verizon response only.

3-5D. Verizon response only.

3-5E. Verizon response only.

3-5F. Verizon response only.

**Person Responsible:** Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

**Date:** May 23, 2006

New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
Generic Investigation Into Utility Poles  
Docket No. DM 05-172  
UES Response to Follow-Up Data Requests Set 3, Topic 2

---

**Request No. Staff Ref 3-6:**

All - Please supply the following information regarding time associated with pole setting activities. Your responses should exclude emergency or call-out work and related activities that may be charged to a pole setting job.

- 3-6A. The average amount of pole set time in hours currently factored into job scheduling by garage per pole set.
- 3-6B. Average travel time in hours currently factored into job scheduling by garage per pole set.
- 3-6C. The average actual amount of pole set time in hours by garage per pole set for the years 2002 through 2005.

**Response:**

- 3-6A. Please see Unital's response to Staff 1-34 [2.25 crew-hours per pole]. The response includes travel time, as well as the installation of occasional anchors.
- 3-6B. As stated in 3-6A above, travel time is factored into the Company's productivity objective for pole setting.
- 3-6C. Unital records the actual crew time per pole set, and reviews this information as part of the project management of every job. However this information is not maintained in a format that would permit a response in the manner requested. Furthermore, a significant portion of our pole setting is performed by contractors on fixed price basis.

**Person Responsible:** Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

**Date:** May 23, 2006

New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
Generic Investigation Into Utility Poles  
Docket No. DM 05-172  
UES Response to Follow-Up Data Requests Set 3, Topic 2

---

**Request No. Staff Ref 3-7:**

- 3-7A. All – please specify the average time it takes for your company to set a solely-owned pole from the day your customer requests a new pole set.
- 3-7B. All – Please specify the average time it takes for your company to set a jointly-owned pole from the day your customer requests a new pole set.
- 3-7C. All – Please specify the average time it takes for your joint pole owner to set a jointly-owned pole from the day your customer requests a new pole set.

**Response:**

- 3-7A. Although this information is not tracked in the normal course of business, Unitil endeavors to install such poles within ten (10) business days from the date of the request.
- 3-7B. Although this information is not tracked in the normal course of business, Unitil endeavors to install such poles within ten (10) business days from the date of the request.
- 3-7C. Unitil does not maintain records on the length of time it takes for the other joint pole owner to set a jointly owned pole, and therefore cannot provide the average time. It has been our experience, however, that Verizon typically quotes 8 weeks in the field, but typically almost always fails to meet this timeframe.

**Person Responsible:** Scott Wade, Dale Nudd

**Date:** May 23, 2006

New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
Generic Investigation Into Utility Poles  
Docket No. DM 05-172  
UES Response to Follow-Up Data Requests Set 3, Topic 2

---

**Request No. Staff Ref 3-8:**

3-8A. All – What is the prioritization policy for pole sets by garage or work area? If written, please provide that policy. How does management ensure the policy is enforced?

**Response:**

Unitil does not have a formal policy for the prioritization of pole sets. In general, poles identified as threats to public safety would be replaced immediately. Other than these emergencies, Unitil strives to meet the need dates of customers, state and municipal government entities, other utilities, as well as internal requirements. Work is prioritized on an on-going basis to meet need dates and project expectations. When work exceeds available resources, Unitil contracts out pole setting work as required to meet need dates.

**Person Responsible:** Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

**Date:** May 23, 2006

New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
Generic Investigation Into Utility Poles  
Docket No. DM 05-172  
UES Response to Follow-Up Data Requests Set 3, Topic 2

---

**Request No. Staff Ref 3-9A**

3-9A. For the double poles identified below it is requested that the applicable electric company and Verizon provide the following:

- ? A copy of the initiating contact memo between the electric company and Verizon identifying the need for the pole replacement.
- ? The actual date of the new pole installation.
- ? The actual date of the electric company transfer.
- ? The specific date of the fire alarm transfer, if applicable.
- ? The specific date of the CATV transfer, if applicable.
- ? The scheduled/pending date of telephone plant transfer.
- ? The scheduled/pending date of the old pole removal.
- ? Copies of all work orders and correspondence between all involved Parties including cable television, municipal and state agencies from the inception of each pole replacement up to the current status.

Minot Street, Concord

Verizon Pole # 302/1

Unitil Pole # 1

New Pole: 35 foot class 4 – date stamped 2001

Verizon plant awaiting transfer all others have transferred.

Ridge Road, Concord

Verizon Pole # 9/4

Unitil Pole # 3

New Pole: 40 foot class 4 – date stamp 12-04

Verizon, Fire Alarm & CATV have not transferred (old pole tagged condemned at base by Unitil).

Ridge Road, Concord

Verizon Pole # 9/18

Unitil # 17

New Pole: 35 foot class 4 – date stamped 2002

Verizon & CATV have not transferred.

Centre Street, Concord

Verizon Pole # 2/ 40

Unitil Pole # 40

New Pole: 40 foot class 4 – date stamped 2000

New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
Generic Investigation Into Utility Poles  
Docket No. DM 05-172  
UES Response to Follow-Up Data Requests Set 3, Topic 2

---

Verizon & CATV have not transferred.

East Side Drive, Concord

Verizon Pole # 175/15

Unitil Pole # 15

New Pole 45 foot class 3 – date stamped 2003

Verizon plant awaiting transfer all others have transferred.

East Side Drive, Concord

Verizon Pole # 175/16

Unitil Pole # 16

New pole 45 foot class 3 – date stamped 2003

Verizon plant awaiting transfer all others have transferred.

**Response:**

Minot Street, Concord

Verizon Pole # 302/1

Unitil Pole # 1

New Pole: 35 foot class 4 – date stamped 2001

Verizon plant awaiting transfer all others have transferred.

1. An initial contact memo was not utilized. Initial contact would have been a field meeting between the company representatives, date unknown.
2. New pole installed 4/12/2002.
3. Electric Company transferred 4/12/2002.
4. Date of fire alarm transfer - unknown.
5. Date of CATV transfer – unknown.
6. Scheduled / pending date of telephone plant transfer – unknown.
7. Scheduled / pending date of the old pole removal – unknown.
8. Refer to Attachment 3-9A.

Ridge Road, Concord

Verizon Pole # 9/4

Unitil Pole # 3

New Pole: 40 foot class 4 – date stamp 12-04

Verizon, Fire Alarm & CATV have not transferred (old pole tagged condemned at base by Unitil).



New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
Generic Investigation Into Utility Poles  
Docket No. DM 05-172  
UES Response to Follow-Up Data Requests Set 3, Topic 2

---

1. An initial contact memo was not utilized. Initial contact would have been a field meeting between the company representatives, date unknown.
2. New pole installed 4/13/2005.
3. Electric Company transferred 3/22/2006.
4. Date of fire alarm transfer – unknown.
5. Date of CATV transfer – unknown.
6. Scheduled / pending date of telephone plant transfer – unknown.
7. Scheduled / pending date of the old pole removal – unknown.
8. No correspondence.

Ridge Road, Concord

Verizon Pole # 9/18

Unitil # 17

New Pole: 35 foot class 4 – date stamped 2002

Verizon & CATV have not transferred.

1. An initial contact memo was not utilized. Initial contact would have been a field meeting between the company representatives, date unknown.
2. New pole installed 6/19/2003.
3. Electric Company transferred 7/24/2003.
4. Date of fire alarm transfer – unknown.
5. Date of CATV transfer – unknown.
6. Scheduled / pending date of telephone plant transfer – unknown.
7. Scheduled / pending date of the old pole removal – unknown.
8. Refer to Attachment 3-9A.

Centre Street, Concord

Verizon Pole # 2/ 40

Unitil Pole # 40

New Pole: 40 foot class 4 – date stamped 2000

Verizon & CATV have not transferred.

1. An initial contact memo was not utilized. Initial contact would have been a field meeting between the company representatives, date unknown.
2. New pole installed 9/1/2000.
3. Electric Company transferred 9/1/2000.
4. Date of fire alarm transfer – unknown.
5. Date of CATV transfer – unknown.

New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
Generic Investigation Into Utility Poles  
Docket No. DM 05-172  
UES Response to Follow-Up Data Requests Set 3, Topic 2

---

6. Scheduled / pending date of telephone plant transfer – unknown.
7. Scheduled / pending date of the old pole removal – unknown.
8. Refer to Attachment 3-9A.

East Side Drive, Concord

Verizon Pole # 175/15

Unitil Pole # 15

New Pole 45 foot class 3 – date stamped 2003

Verizon plant awaiting transfer all others have transferred.

1. An initial contact memo was not utilized. Initial contact would have been a field meeting between the company representatives, date unknown.
2. New pole installed 7/14/2003.
3. Electric Company transferred 7/16/2003.
4. Date of fire alarm transfer – unknown.
5. Date of CATV transfer – unknown.
6. Scheduled / pending date of telephone plant transfer – unknown.
7. Scheduled / pending date of the old pole removal – unknown.
8. No correspondence.

East Side Drive, Concord

Verizon Pole # 175/16

Unitil Pole # 16

New pole 45 foot class 3 – date stamped 2003

Verizon plant awaiting transfer all others have transferred.

1. An initial contact memo was not utilized. Initial contact would have been a field meeting between the company representatives, date unknown.
2. New pole installed 7/14/2003.
3. Electric Company transferred 7/17/2003.
4. Date of fire alarm transfer – unknown.
5. Date of CATV transfer – unknown.
6. Scheduled / pending date of telephone plant transfer – unknown.
7. Scheduled / pending date of the old pole removal – unknown.
8. No correspondence.

**Person Responsible:** Dale Nudd

**Date:** May 23, 2006

New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
Generic Investigation Into Utility Poles  
Docket No. DM 05-172  
UES Response to Follow-Up Data Requests Set 3, Topic 2

---

**Request No. Staff Ref 3-11:**

- 3-11A. PSNH – Please explain how PSNH's practice of over-lashing the secondary to the neutral conforms to the NESC.
- 3-11B. All – Please provide any written policy regarding your over-lashing practice.
- 3-11C. NHDOT – Please provide any data that show delays in construction due to electric company or Verizon delays, by utility and project, for 2002-2005. Please provide the delays by number of weeks and any increase in cost due to the delays. Please state whether NHDOT sought reimbursement for any such cost increases due to construction delays and from whom any such reimbursements were received. If so, has that had any impact on the process?

**Response:**

- 3-11A. PSNH response only.
- 3-11B. Unitil does not have a policy or practice regarding over-lashing.
- 3-11C. NHDOT response only.

**Person Responsible:** Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

**Date:** May 23, 2006

New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
Generic Investigation Into Utility Poles  
Docket No. DM 05-172  
UES Response to Follow-Up Data Requests Set 3, Topic 2

---

**Request No. Staff Ref 3-26:**

- 3-26A. All – Please provide the number of danger trees removed by year from 2000-2005. Of the total, please indicate how many removals involved joint owner participation and how many were paid by the joint owner.
- 3-26B. VZ - Please supply the trimming dollars included in rates from Docket DT 89-010 broken down into expensed normal maintenance trimming, expensed danger tree removal, and trimming or tree removal that is associated with construction which is capitalized. Also, as part of your response, please supply the actual expenditures for each category from 1990 through 2005.
- 3-26C. Electrics Only - For the years 2000 through 2005, please supply:
- The number of danger trees identified;
  - The number of danger trees that Verizon agreed to participate in removing;
  - The number of danger trees that Verizon declined to participate in removing;
  - The number of danger trees still awaiting a reply from Verizon;
  - The number of danger trees removed, broken out between electric company and Verizon;
  - Total cost of removal of danger trees;
  - The dollar amount reimbursed by Verizon according to your individual agreements.

**Response:**

- 3-26A. Unitil does not specifically track this data in the normal course of business. It is our recent experience that Verizon does not fully participate in these costs, nor have they completely responded to notifications for a field review required prior to removal. Please see Attachment UES-Staff Ref 3-26.
- 3-26B. Verizon response only.
- 3-26C. Unitil does not specifically track this data in the normal course of business. However we endeavor to remove hazardous trees or tree limbs during the course of scheduled maintenance even if it is outside the established trim zone. Additionally, from time to time

New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
Generic Investigation Into Utility Poles  
Docket No. DM 05-172  
UES Response to Follow-Up Data Requests Set 3, Topic 2

---

specific areas are identified as needing danger trees or limbs removed as a result of reliability concerns (repetitive outages) or upon being discovered by line or supervisory personnel. It is our recent experience that Verizon does not fully participate in the division of costs, nor have they completely responded to a notification for a for field review required prior to removal.

**Person Responsible:** Scott D. Wade, Dale Nudd

**Date:** May 23, 2006

New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
Generic Investigation Into Utility Poles  
Docket No. DM 05-172  
UES Response to Follow-Up Data Requests Set 3, Topic 2

---

**Request No. Staff Ref 3-27:**

- 3-27A. Electrics – Please provide reliability stats by voltage level 2000-2005.
- 3-27B. VZ – For each question asked in set 3 where Verizon stated that the information requested is not kept in the ordinary course of business, please explain why that information is not kept in the ordinary course of business (e.g., the data are aggregated and cannot be disaggregated).
- 3-27C. All – If an electric company is constructing a new line addition in a Verizon set area, who would be responsible for the trimming and to whose specs? Are applicable specs laid out in the IOP?
- 3-27D. VZ – When Verizon plans 4X4 trimming for new cable placement, when does it ask the joint owner whether that joint owner wants to participate in trimming? If Verizon doesn't ask, why not?
- 3-27E. Electrics Only - Please explain in detail how your company determines when a total circuit requires maintenance trimming by distribution voltage class level. If reliability performance is part of your response, please specifically and separately state how both frequency and duration is factored into your decision for permanent faults and how the frequency of momentary outages is factored into your decision.
- 3-27F. Electrics Only - Please explain in detail how your company determines when a total circuit or portion of a circuit requires hot spot trimming by distribution voltage class level. If reliability performance is part of your response, please specifically and separately state how both frequency and duration is factored into your decision for permanent faults and how frequency of momentary outages is factored into your decision.
- 3-27G. Electrics Only - As part of your quarterly reliability submittals to the NHPUC, each company tracks a proxy for momentary outages. Please explain how this information is used in your maintenance trimming and hot spot trimming decisions. If this information is not used, please explain why not.

**Response:**

New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission  
Generic Investigation Into Utility Poles  
Docket No. DM 05-172  
UES Response to Follow-Up Data Requests Set 3, Topic 2

---

- 3-27A. Reliability statistics by voltage level are provided as Attachment UES-Staff Ref 3-27A. Voltage information was not collected on the trouble interruption reports prior to 2002.
- 3-27B. Verizon response only.
- 3-27C. The customer is responsible for tree clearing along a private property line extension. If the new line addition is along public way and is in Verizon's maintenance area, it is normally Verizon's responsibility to coordinate and perform the tree trimming. The minimum specifications are provided in the Intercompany Operating Procedures (IOP).
- 3-27D. Verizon response only.
- 3-27E. Unitil employs a fixed time interval cyclical trimming program, differentiated by voltage class. Please see Staff 3-27, Attachment UES-Staff 3-27, for a description of Unitil's Vegetation Management program.
- 3-27F. Unitil avoids hot spot trimming to the extent possible. Please see Staff 3-27, Attachment UES-Staff 3-27, for a description of Unitil's Vegetation Management program. Unitil does regularly monitor reliability of our circuits, including monthly fuse operations, recloser counts, and customer calls and may perform unscheduled maintenance trimming based on this information as well as a field review of the facilities involved.
- 3-27G. Unitil submits information on momentary outages with our fourth quarter reliability statistics. This information is reviewed periodically during the year and may be utilized for trimming decisions. However, this information is not a primary driver of maintenance trimming decisions. Unitil believes in a proactive cyclical trimming program, rather than a reactionary program driven by declining reliability performance. Hot spot trimming is minimized to the extent possible (see 3-27F).

**Person Responsible:** Raymond A. Letourneau, Jr.

**Date:** May 23, 2006